

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration of the Application in view of the Amendments and Remarks stated herein.

Claims 1, 11 and 17 were objected to for informalities regarding the relation between “search parameters” and “one or more search parameters.” These claims have been amended to further clarify that the local and remote search modules can identify data items that match one or more search parameters that may be a part of the search parameters which the search modules are operable to receive.

Claim 1 recites “a local search module” and a “remote search module stored in the memory subsystem on the mobile device,” the local search module causes the “mobile device to identify one or more data items stored in the local application database” and the remote search module causes the “mobile device to transmit a remote search request to the server... wherein the server uses the search parameters included in the search request to identify one or more data items stored in the server application database matching the one or more search parameters.” Claim 1 further recites “wherein the one or more search parameters are entered into the mobile device by a user and indicate a characteristic of the data items that are to be identified.”

The Wright reference does not disclose a mobile device searching local databases for information, and subsequently, remote databases for the same information when search parameters are entered into the mobile device by a user and indicate a characteristic of the data items that are to be identified. Wright only discloses the server updating databases stored on the mobile device (Wright, col. 5, ll. 52-54), and a session where some information (i.e., work orders, inventory on a product and a monthly price list update) is automatically retrieved upon periodic connections (Wright, col. 6, ll. 46-54). Wright does not, however, disclose a user entering search parameters to search a database both locally and remotely. Claim 1 can enable a user of a mobile device to search a local database for characteristics of data items that they wish to identify, and also to search a remote database for the same characteristic. Claim 1, and claims 2-7 dependent on claim 1 are therefore not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).


Independent claim 8 recites “wherein the one or more search parameters are entered into the mobile device by a user and indicate a characteristic of the data items that are to be identified.” This and similar language appears in claim 1. Therefore, claim 8, and claims 9-10

dependent from claim 8 are unobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in condition for allowance.

Regarding independent claims 11 and 17, they have been amended and also include the language of claim 1. Therefore, claims 11 and 17, as well as dependent claims 12-16 and 18 are in condition for allowance for the same reasons discussed with reference to claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn, and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph M. Sauer (Reg. No. 47,919)
Jones Day
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7506